

**Indiana Professional Standards Board  
External Committee for School Leaders**

Selections  
March 8, 2002

Members Present: John Hill (chairperson), Ed Burkhalter, Earlene Holland, Cindy Finney, Pam Frampton, Kathy Sherman, Peggy Hinckley, Phyllis Amick, Steve Heck, Earl Williams, Sue Switzer, Nancy Carey, Deb Lecklider, Becky Libler, Gary Collings (recorder)

Members Absent: Roger Thornton, Dan Grayson, Miriam Matthews, Mike Horvath

Staff Present: Shawn Sriver, Judy Miller, Marie Theobald

Guests Present: Brad Balch (ISU), Larry Gambaiani (ISU)

---

The External Committee for School Leaders of the Indiana Professional Standards Board convened at 9:30 AM on March 8, 2002 at the MSD Washington Township Community and Education Center, Indianapolis.

I. Announcements - John Hill, chairperson, called the meeting to order. Shawn Sriver distributed a new list of e-mail and mailing addresses. The selections of the February 8, 2002 meeting were accepted as presented.

II. Report: School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) - Gary Collings reported that the committee's recommendation to the IPSB Executive Committee at its February 20, 2002 meeting was well received and approved as presented. The approved recommendation read as follows:

Beginning January 1, 2003, beginning administrators shall complete the SLLA as a condition of licensure.

Beginning January 1, 2003, successful completion of the SLLA shall require a qualifying score of 158 or better.

Beginning January 1, 2005, successful completion of the SLLA shall require a qualifying score of 165.

It was noted that an administrator will need to successfully complete the SLLA only once in his/her career.

Gary Collings will present the External Committee recommendation, as approved by the Executive Committee, to the full membership of the IPSB at its March 20, 2002 meeting.

III. Review: Purposes of Pilot I, II, III - John Hill discussed a handout titled Beginning Administrator Pilot Programs, which gave the purpose, timeline, oversight, and

implementation period for Pilot I (portfolio assessment), Pilot II (mentorship), and Pilot III (continuing education).

IV. Report: Subcommittee for Continuing Education (Pilot III) – Gary Collings reviewed the following expected outcomes for this pilot. The design of Pilot III should address proficient practitioner licensure renewal including the: (1) efficacy of the 90 point system chart; (2) feasibility of differentiated professional growth team models; (3) growth plans demonstrating proficiency across standards (two or more?); (4) reporting format for IPSB to confirm license renewal recommendations; (5) local and state auditing process (sampling of records) for Professional Growth Team reports; and (6) structure of a Pool to be maintained by the IPSB for assignment of the mentor advisor. During the course of the morning meeting, members reviewed and discussed the seven sections of the interim report of the subcommittee.

Marie Theobald reported that the University Consortium with representatives from IU, ISU, BSU, and Purdue is contracted under Title II funds for the Pilot I. Under the contract extension clauses, she proposes extending and expanding the contract under the University Consortium model, including other entities as necessary, to cover the Pilot III provisions. The contract would include, but not necessarily be limited to:

- a. identifying any necessary interface of Pilot III (Continuing Education) with Pilot II (Induction - Mentoring) and Pilot I (Portfolio)
- b. implementing the overall pilot set-up, follow-up, periodic reporting, and compilation of the pilot outcomes
- c. conducting the orientation, training and follow-up sessions
- d. developing the training materials
- e. addressing the essential benchmarks
- f. allowing candidates to use documentation from previous three years (back mapping)
- g. considering an electronic format for the manual and professional growth plan to enhance portability of the plans

Members agreed that the involvement of representatives from the School Leaders Committee to serve as a liaison to the consortium would be an enhancement to the Pilot III. He observed that the subcommittee approach seems to be working well. Shawn Sriver observed that the subcommittee approach seems to be working well.

Steve Heck inquired about the financial implications of the three pilots regarding costs for mentor stipends, training, etc. Although this external committee's approach has been to strive for excellence, the continued question has been whether the IPSB will have the resources and personnel to accomplish the commitments. Marie Theobald said that the IPSB is working on a moderate proposal for the next biennium for the General Assembly, which addresses such anticipated costs. Legislators have been invited to a recruitment and retention conference on March 16-17. She is encouraged how the pilots will give the IPSB a track record of what has been tried and with what results. From the outcomes of the pilots the IPSB can better answer the question of what works best for the funding

requests. Shawn Sriver noted that the mentorship pilot will begin this Fall for a two year period meaning that July 1, 2005 is the earliest that mentors will begin.

Members discussed the strategy of presenting either a realistic or ideal request to the legislature for funding of induction and continuing education. Marie Theobald commented that the Title II funds will cover the pilot study expenses. In reply to a question, Shawn Sriver responded that a cost analysis was done last year for the two year induction phase and the continuing education model would have less fiscal impact. Deb Lecklider proposed that a possible interim study committee on educational leadership may be another avenue to the General Assembly.

Brad Balch asked if one's renewal of multiple instructional and administrative licenses would require multiple professional growth teams or would credits/experiences serve dual purposes? Shawn Sriver replied that currently CRUs need to be in either education or an area on one's license. The course work, for example, in education can be used to renew licenses in both teaching and administration. If, however, the CRU is specific to a content area, it can only be applied for renewal of that specific license.

Nancy Carey inquired about the July 1, 2006 date for no more license renewals under Rules 46-47. Judy Miller reminded the members that the rules have not yet been promulgated and this date and others are only to be considered as working dates. Shawn Sriver clarified that candidates may continue to renew under Rules 46-47 with six credit hours unless the candidate opts to renew with 90 CRUs, which has to be under the Professional Growth Team provisions of Rule 2002. He emphasized that a five year transition period, for example, after the rules and dates are promulgated may be necessary so that renewals are not blocked. Members agreed that what may change is how the candidate documents his/her eligibility for renewal.

Pam Frampton suggested an alternative for a state level team to convene annually to review professional growth team recommendations as submitted from local school corporations.

Deb Lecklider mentioned the national trend toward on-line courses and the commercial providers of professional development. Marie Theobald replied about the increasing number of requests from out-of-state on-line entities seeking endorsement from the IPSB. She said an entity must be written into an in-state IHE's unit assessment system plan and the IHE must be willing to grant credit. Otherwise, students completing such out-of-state on-line programs must seek a teaching license from the host state and then apply to the IPSB for an Indiana license. Members talked about the importance of maintaining the balance of interpersonal interactions.

After the external committee meeting was adjourned, the subcommittee convened for a brief session to discuss drafting a development and reporting manual for the professional growth plan for school leaders.

The next subcommittee meeting will be April 26 (1:00 PM) at the MSD Washington Township Center.

V. Report: Pilot I (Portfolio) - Larry Gambaiani reported on the progress of 5 students with whom he is working in the southern group. Brad Balch commented that the total 20 pending portfolios are expected to be completed on time. Marie Theobald noted that she would be seeking five volunteers for an ETS sponsored event on July 10-11 for a standards setting session. Becky Libler remarked that our attrition rate of portfolio completers was not out of the ordinary from what she heard at a recent meeting in Washington.

VI. Report: Pilot II (Mentoring) - Marie Theobald reported that this pilot is still in the planning stages.

VII. Indiana Promise Consortium - During lunch, Deb Lecklider and Brad Balch briefed the members on this consortium, which is seeking policy changes to enhance school leadership. Besides the state grant from the Wallace DeWitt Foundation for the consortium, the Fort Wayne Community Schools have been designated by the foundation as the pilot school site for Indiana. The draft working plan includes proposals for legislative approval of a summer interim study committee on educational leadership, recognition of the consortium as an advisory group to the Education Roundtable, and support for the consortium to recruit minorities and women to educational leadership positions. The work of the consortium is to raise the awareness of educational leadership issues and address support for school leaders through recruitment, retention, and professional development. Brad Balch is completing a literature review and preparing a survey for principals, superintendents, and perhaps school board members. He may also have some focus groups including those who are licensed but not practicing in school administration.

In anticipation that the General Assembly will approve a resolution for an interim study committee on educational leadership, Deb Lecklider recommended that this external committee have a subcommittee in place to present testimony this summer. This subcommittee should be prepared to address professional development, retention, recruitment, and mentor needs.

**CONSENSUS:** Members agreed to form a subcommittee to be on call should the interim study committee be approved. Volunteers for this committee were Deb Lecklider, John Hill, Pam Frampton, Brad Balch, and Gary Collings.

**NEXT MEETING:** June 14, 2002 (9:30 AM)

**LOCATION:** MSD of Washington Township Community and Education Center (Indianapolis)